



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/891,727	06/26/2001	Daniel M. Kinzer	IR-1698 (2-2027)	1370

2352 7590 01/28/2003

OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN  
1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK, NY 100368403

EXAMINER

LEWIS, MONICA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2822

DATE MAILED: 01/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/891,727

Applicant(s)

KINZER ET AL.

Examiner

Monica Lewis

Art Unit

2822

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 November 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2822

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed November 6, 2002.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper."

Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2822

5. Claims 1-6 and 8-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kitamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,844,275) in view of Ranjan (U.S. Patent No. 5,861,657), Sakakibara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,449,946) and Uenishi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,040,600).

In regards to claim 1, Kitamura et al. ("Kitamura") discloses the following:

- a) a substrate (1) of one of the conductivity types (See Figure 1);
- b) an epitaxially deposited trench receiving layer (2) of said one of the conductivity types supported atop said substrate and having an upper surface (See Figure 1);
- c) a plurality of spaced laterally extending trenches formed into said trench-receiving layer (See Figure 9);
- d) a diffusion of the other of said conductivity types extending into the walls of said trenches (3) and having a given depth and a given concentration (See Figure 1);
- e) trenches defining mesas between them of a given width and a given concentration (See Figure 9);
- f) a drain region (11) of said other of said conductivity types extending into, said trench receiving layer and disposed at the end of said mesas (See Figure 1); and
- g) a MOSgate structure including a source region (9), base region (8) and a gate electrode (7) disposed at the other end of said mesas (See Figure 1).

In regards to claim 1, Kitamura fails to disclose the following:

- a) a monocrystalline semiconductor wafer.

However, Sakakibara et al. ("Sakakibara") discloses a monocrystalline semiconductor wafer (See Column 1 Lines 59-62). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the semiconductor device of Kitamura to include a monocrystalline semiconductor wafer as disclosed in Sakakibara because it aids in preventing capacitive coupling.

Art Unit: 2822

Additionally, since Kitamura and Sakakibara are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Sakakibara would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Kitamura.

b) the thickness and concentration of said mesas and said diffusions being selected to cause each to fully deplete under blocking voltage conditions.

However, Ranjan discloses a semiconductor device where the mesas and diffusions vary (See Column 2 Lines 7-16). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the semiconductor device of Kitamura to include mesas and diffusions that vary as disclosed in Ranjan because it provides a smaller lateral extent and takes up less chip area.

Additionally, since Kitamura and Ranjan are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Ranjan would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Kitamura.

c) mesas extend between said drain and said MOSgate structure.

However, Uenishi et al. ("Uenishi") discloses a semiconductor device where the mesas extend between said drain and said MOSgate structure (See Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the semiconductor device of Kitamura to include mesas that extend between said drain and said MOSgate structure as disclosed in Uenishi because it aids in providing a high breakdown voltage.

Additionally, since Kitamura and Uenishi are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Uenishi would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Kitamura.

In regards to claim 2, Kitamura discloses the following:

- a) a dielectric filler (5) in each of said trenches (See Figure 1).

In regards to claim 3, Kitamura discloses the following:

- a) source, drain and gate contacts (14, 7, and 15) supported on said upper surface and connected to said source region, gate electrode and drain regions respectively (See Figure 1).

In regards to claim 4, Kitamura discloses the following:

- a) substrate is a lightly doped P type material (See Figure 1).

In regards to claim 4, Kitamura fails to disclose the following:

- a) diffusion and said mesas have RESURF concentrations.

However, Ranjan discloses a semiconductor device where the mesas and diffusions have RESURF (See Column 1 Lines 17-20 and Column 2 Lines 7-16). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the semiconductor device of Kitamura to include mesas and diffusions that have RESURF as disclosed in Ranjan because it aids in controlling the breakdown voltage.

Additionally, since Kitamura and Ranjan are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Ranjan would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Kitamura.

In regards to claim 5, Kitamura fails to disclose the following:

- a) a further region of said other conductivity interposed between said substrate and said trench receiving layer being more lightly doped than said diffusion.

Art Unit: 2822

However, Sakakibara discloses a further region (2a) of said other conductivity interposed between said substrate and said trench receiving layer (See Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the semiconductor device of Kitamura to include a further region as disclosed in Sakakibara because it aids in preventing capacitive coupling.

Additionally, since Kitamura and Sakakibara are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Sakakibara would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Kitamura.

b) diffusion extending into said further region along the bottoms of said trenches.

However, Ranjan discloses a semiconductor device where the diffusion (23) extends (See Column 2 Lines 7-16). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the semiconductor device of Kitamura to include diffusion that extends as disclosed in Ranjan because it aids in the formation of isolated regions.

Additionally, since Kitamura and Ranjan are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Ranjan would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Kitamura.

In regards to claim 6, Kitamura fails to disclose the following:

a) diffusion extending into said further region along the bottoms of said trenches.

However, Ranjan discloses a semiconductor device where the diffusion extends (See Column 2 Lines 7-16). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to modify the semiconductor device of Kitamura to include diffusion that extends as disclosed in Ranjan because it aids in the formation of isolated regions.

Additionally, since Kitamura and Ranjan are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Ranjan would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Kitamura.

In regards to claims 8 and 15, Kitamura discloses the following:

- a) a dielectric filler in each of said trenches (See Figure 1).

In regards to claims 9, 11, 16 and 18, Kitamura discloses the following:

- a) source, drain and gate contacts supported on said upper surface and connected to said source region, gate electrode and drain regions respectively (See Figure 1).

In regards to claims 10, 12-14, 17 and 19-21, Kitamura discloses the following:

- a) substrate is a lightly doped P type material (See Figure 1).

In regards to claims 10, 12-14, 17 and 19-21, Kitamura fails to disclose the following:

- a) diffusion and said mesas have RESURF concentrations.

However, Ranjan discloses a semiconductor device where the mesas and diffusions have RESURF (See Column 1 Lines 17-20 and Column 2 Lines 7-16). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the semiconductor device of Kitamura to include mesas and diffusions that have RESURF as disclosed in Ranjan because it aids in controlling the breakdown voltage.



Additionally, since Kitamura and Ranjan are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Ranjan would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Kitamura.

6. Claims 7 and 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kitamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,844,275) in view of Ranjan (U.S. Patent No. 5,861,657), Sakakibara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,449,946), Uenishi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,040,600) and Malhi (U.S. Patent No. 5,539,238).

In regards to claim 7, Kitamura fails to disclose the following:

a) insulation layer interposed between said substrate and said trench receiving layer the upper surface of said insulation layer being coplanar with the bottoms of said trenches.

However, Malhi discloses an insulating layer (See Column 3 Lines 13-18). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the semiconductor device of Kitamura to include an insulating layer as disclosed in Malhi because it aids in keeping the devices from shortening out.

Additionally, since Kitamura and Malhi are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Malhi would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Kitamura.

In regards to claim 22, Kitamura discloses the following:

a) a dielectric filler in each of said trenches (See Figure 1).

In regards to claims 23 and 25 Kitamura discloses the following:

a) source, drain and gate contacts supported on said upper surface and connected to said source region, gate electrode and drain regions respectively (See Figure 1).

In regards to claims 24 and 26-28 Kitamura discloses the following:

- a) substrate is a lightly doped P type material (See Figure 1).

In regards to claims 24 and 26-28 Kitamura fails to disclose the following:

- a) diffusion and said mesas have RESURF concentrations.

However, Ranjan discloses a semiconductor device where the mesas and diffusions have RESURF (See Column 1 Lines 17-20 and Column 2 Lines 7-16). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the semiconductor device of Kitamura to include mesas and diffusions that have RESURF as disclosed in Ranjan because it aids in controlling the breakdown voltage.

Additionally, since Kitamura and Ranjan are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Ranjan would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Kitamura.

### ***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2822

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: a) Baliga et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,679,966) discloses a depleted base transistor; b) Nitta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,307,246) discloses a resurf device; c) Van Dalen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0130358) discloses a semiconductor device; and d) Baliga (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0177277) discloses a power semiconductor device.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monica Lewis whose telephone number is 703-305-3743. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amir Zarabian can be reached on 703-308-4905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-308-7722 for regular and after final communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

ML

January 18, 2003

  
AMIR ZARABIAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800